<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 29, 31, 32, 34, 43, 45, 46 and 48 remain pending in the application, with Claims 1, 7, 15, 29 and 43 being independent and having been amended herein.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20, 29, 31, 32, 34, 43, 45, 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,206,735 (<u>Gauronski et al.</u>) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,825 (<u>Davidson et al.</u>) and U.S. Patent No. 5,239,648 (<u>Nukui et al.</u>). Claims 7, 9-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,130,757 (<u>Yoshida et al.</u>) in view of <u>Davidson et al.</u> and <u>Nukui et al.</u> Claim 8 was rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over <u>Yoshida et al.</u> in view of <u>Davidson et al.</u>, <u>Nukui et al.</u> and <u>Gauronski et al</u>. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed previously, <u>Gauronski et al.</u> is directed to an electronic printer with a scanner, in which interruption of a job to process a special job is effected by interrupting the job currently being scanned by the scanner to scan the special job while continuing printing of the other jobs in the print queue until the special job is ready. The job being printed is then interrupted to print the special job, while resuming scanning of the interrupted job, and then printing of the interrupted job is continued upon completion of the special job. Applicant

submits that in <u>Gauronski et al.</u> multiple interrupt printing can be inhibited and an operator can be sent a message that interrupt printing has failed.

However, <u>Gauronski et al.</u> is not believed to disclose or suggest at least receiving job information from a printer indicating that interrupt printing of an instructed print job has failed, with the job information including information that can specify an owner of the print job, determining whether the owner of the print job specified in the information included the received job information is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus based on the job information, and i) causing a display unit to display that the instructed print job has not been interrupt printed, if determined that the owner of the print job is identical to the user of the information processing apparatus, and ii) not causing the display unit to display that the instructed print job has not been interrupt printed, if determined that the owner of the print job is not identical to the user of the information processing apparatus, as is recited in independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 43. Nor does <u>Gauronski et al.</u> disclose or suggest at least that one information processing apparatus i) causes a display unit to display that the print job has not been interrupt printed if it is decided that the owner of the print job specified by the information included the job information transmitted by a transfer unit is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus and ii) does not cause the display unit to display that the print job has not been interrupt printed, if it is decided that the owner of the print job is not identical to the user of the information processing apparatus, as is recited in independent claim 7.

Thus, <u>Gauronski et al.</u> fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

The printing system of <u>Davidson, Jr. et al.</u> has at least one host computer and a printer. The printer can acquire print job accounting information and communicate this information to the host computer, which can store the job accounting information in a memory. The print job accounting information can include a network user name, which can include the host's identifier and the user's identification.

As discussed previously, referring to Figure 5C and column 19, line 39, to column 20, line 7, <u>Davidson, Jr. et al.</u> describes in function block 380 that a Job Accounting Alert is sent to host computer 16 having MARKVISION™ installed. While the Job Accounting Alert may include user ID and host ID, the user ID or host ID is simply one of the attributes provided in the print job history. Therefore, whether the Alert is sent to the host is not closely related to the user ID or host ID. <u>Davidson, Jr. et al.</u> does not disclose or suggest causing a display unit to display that an instructed print job has not been interrupt printed, if determined that the owner of the print job is identical to the user of the information processing apparatus and not causing the display unit to display that an instructed print job has not been interrupt printed, if determined that the owner of the print job is not identical to the user of the information processing apparatus. <u>Davidson, Jr. et al.</u> is not believed to remedy the deficiencies of <u>Gauronski et al.</u> noted above with respect to the independent claims.

<u>Nukui et al.</u> relates to a computer network that is capable of accessing a file remotely between computer systems. In a file access operation, a personal ID of the user ID is compared with that of the owner ID. If they are matched, a file access portion references an access authority with the owner personal ID. However, the steps in <u>Nukui et al.</u> are performed in

a file access operation, not an interrupt printing operation. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to <u>Nukui et al.</u> to modify the job interrupt in the electronic printer of <u>Gauronski</u>.

Yoshida et al. has also been reviewed, but is not believed to be any more relevant than the citations discussed above. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the file access operation of <u>Nukui et al.</u> to modify the job management of <u>Yoshida et al.</u>

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7, 15, 29 and 43 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 7, 15, 29 and 43. Dependent Claims 3, 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 31, 32, 34, 45, 46 and 48 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in the independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

_____

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York  10112-3801
Facsimile:  (212) 218-2200

MAW/agm

DC_MAIN 250150v1